



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,421	10/18/2001	Robert Sackstein	18989-020	1314
26161	7590	03/23/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC			GAMBEL, PHILLIP	
225 FRANKLIN ST			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02110			1644	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/042,421	Applicant(s) SACKSTEIN, ROBERT	
	Examiner Phillip Gambel	Art Unit 1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-61 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH SEQUENCE RULE</u> |

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Invention I (claims 1-7) on 1/22/04 is acknowledged.

Claims 8-61 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

Claims 1-7 are under consideration in the instant application.

2. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures.

See Table 1 on pages 10-11 of the instant specification and claims 1-7.

Applicant is required to identify all sequences with the appropriate SEQ ID NOS.

Applicant is required to fulfill these requirements.

3. The filing date of the instant claims is deemed to be the filing date of instant application USSN 60/240,987, i.e. 10/18/2000.

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicant should restrict the title to the claimed invention.

5. The application is required to be reviewed and all spelling, TRADEMARKS, and like errors corrected.

Trademarks should be capitalized or accompanied by the TM or [®] symbol wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the trademarks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate corrections are required

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1644

7. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

The specification broadly describes and the claims recite as part of the invention the following:

“A substantially purified glycosylated polypeptide, said glycosylated polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence at least similar to SEQ ID NO: 1, and wherein said glycosylated polypeptide binds to an antibody having the binding specificity of monoclonal antibody HECA-452”.

Such “95% similar to SEQ ID NO: 1 polypeptides” do not meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, whatever is now claimed.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.).

Applicant relies upon identifying the KG1a CD44 glycoprotein by SEQ ID NO:1 and certain other features. However, there is insufficient written description of additional species of KG1a CD44 glycoproteins which are 95% similar to SEQ ID NO:1. The skilled artisan cannot envision the broad genus of the claimed “95% similar to SEQ ID NO: 1 glycosylated polypeptides”.

In the absence of a nexus between structural and functional characteristics that are shared by members of the genus of KG1a CD44 glycoproteins, including those “95% similar to SEQ ID NO: 1”, one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, Applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

In the absence of a detailed chemical structure of the “95% identical to SEQ ID NO: 1 glycosylated polypeptides” which are KG1a CD44 glycoproteins and therefore conception cannot be not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. Here, defining structural features are required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In Fiddes v. Baird, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class.

Art Unit: 1644

While actual reduction to practice is only one of several ways to satisfy the Written Description Requirement; The Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement make clear that if a claimed genus does not show actual reduction to practice for a representative number of species; then the Requirement may be alternatively met by reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the genus (Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 3rd column).

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

8. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the KG1a CD44 glycosylated polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO:1 and certain other features, does not reasonably provide enablement for any KG1a CD44 glycosylated polypeptides which is "95% similar to SEQ ID NO: 1".

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most clearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicant has not provided sufficient biochemical information, particularly the nexus between the structure of SEQ ID NO: 1 and the genus of KG1a CD44 glycosylated polypeptides encompassed by the "95% similar to SEQ ID NO: 1".

Reasonable correlation must exist between the scope of the claims and scope of enablement set forth.

Since the amino acid sequence of a polypeptide determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a polypeptide's amino acid sequence and still retain similar functionality (e.g. L-selectin ligand or E-selectin ligand) requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the polypeptide's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e. expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which a polypeptide's structure relates to its functional usefulness. However, the problem of predicting polypeptide structure from mere sequence data of a single amino acid sequence and in turn utilizing predicted structural determinations to ascertain binding or functional aspects KG1a L-selectin analogs and finally what changes can be tolerated with respect thereto is complex and well outside the realm of routine experimentation.

In re Fisher, 166 USPQ 18 indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute.

Art Unit: 1644

For example, Skolnick et al. (Trends in Biotech., 18(1):34-39, 2000) teach that the skilled artisan is well aware that assigning functional activities for any particular protein or protein family based upon sequence homology is inaccurate, in part because of the multifunctional nature of proteins (e.g., "Abstract" and "Sequence-based approaches to function prediction", page 34). Even in situations where there is some confidence of a similar overall structure between two proteins, only experimental research can confirm the artisan's best guess as to the function of the structurally related protein (see in particular "Abstract" and Box 2).

Because of the lack of sufficient guidance and predictability in determining which modifications would lead to "95% sequence similar to SEQ ID NO: 1" which would be a KG1a CD44 glycoprotein and that the relationship between the sequence of a peptide and its tertiary structure (i.e. its activity) was not well understood and was not predictable (e.g. see Ngo et al., in The Protein Folding Problem and Tertiary Structure Prediction, 1994, Merz et al., (ed.), Birkhauser, Boston, MA, pp. 433 and 492-495.); it would require an undue amount of experimentation for one of skill in the art to arrive at enabling the genus of KG1a CD44 glycosylated polypeptides which are "95% similar to SEQ ID NO: 1".

Without sufficient guidance, making and using the claimed "KG1a CD44 glycosylated polypeptides" which are "95% similar to SEQ ID NO: 1" is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue

9. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention

Claims 1-7: It is apparent that the HECA-452 antibody is required to practice the claimed invention. As a required element, it must be known and readily available to the public or obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification. If it is not so obtainable or available, the enablement requirements of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, may be satisfied by a deposit of the cell line / hybridoma which produces this antibody. See 37 CFR 1.801-1.809.

In addition to the conditions under the Budapest Treaty, applicant is required to satisfy that all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent in U.S. patent applications.

Amendment of the specification to recite the date of deposit and the complete name and address of the depository is required. As an additional means for completing the record, applicant may submit a copy of the contract with the depository for deposit and maintenance of each deposit.

If the original deposit is made after the effective filing date of an application for patent, the applicant should promptly submit a verified statement from a person in a position to corroborate the fact, and should state, that the biological material which is deposited is a biological material specifically identified in the application as filed, except if the person is an attorney or agent registered to practice before the Office, in which the case the statement need not be verified. See MPEP 1.804(b).

Art Unit: 1644

Alternatively, applicant is invited to provide evidence that either the HECA-452 hybridoma was publicly available.

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office Action:

An person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sackstein et al. (Blood 89 : 2773-2781, 1997), as further evidenced by Dimitroff et al. (J. Biol. Chem. 276: 47623-47631, 2001).

Sackstein et al. teach the a hemopoietic cell L-selectin ligand which exhibits sulfate-independent binding activity that appears to be the same KG1a CD44 glycosylated polypeptide of the claimed invention (see entire document, including Abstract, Results and Discussion).

In further evidence, Dimitroff et al. discloses that the L-selectin ligand disclosed in Sackstein et al. (Blood 89 : 2773-2781, 1997) reads on the instant hemopoietic cell E- and L-selectin ligand (see reference 18 cited in the Introduction, particularly page 47623, column 2, paragraph 1).

Applicant is reminded that no more of the reference is required than that it sets forth the substance of the invention. The claimed functional limitations would be inherent properties of the referenced KG1a L-selectin ligand.

Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2112.01.

12. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stamenkovic et al. (EMBO Journal 10: 343—348, 1991) (see entire document, including Figure 1) as evidenced by Sackstein (US 2003/0040607 A1).

Stamenkovic et al. teach hematopoietic and epithelial forms of CD44, including encoding nucleotide and amino acids of CD44, which appear to the same or nearly the same as the instant hematopoietic cell L-selectin / E-selectin ligand (HCELL) also referred to a KG1a CD44, which is a glycoform of CD44 and comprising SEQ ID NO:1 as set forth in Sackstein (US 2003/0040607 A1; see entire document, including Summary of the Invention, Examples, Table 1 and Claims).

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant is reminded that no more of the reference is required than that it sets forth the substance of the invention. The claimed functional limitations would be inherent properties of the referenced CD44 glycoproteins.

Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada* 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2112.01.

13. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obvious-type or non-obvious-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornam*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78 (d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a Terminal Disclaimer. A Terminal Disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

14. Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of copending application USSN 09/619,290, as evidenced by Sackstein (US 2003/0040607 A1). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are drawn to the same or nearly the same hematopoietic cell L-selectin / E-selectin ligands (HCELL) also referred to a KG1a CD44, which is a glycoform of CD44 and comprising SEQ ID NO:1 as set forth in Sackstein (US 2003/0040607 A1; see entire document, including Summary of the Invention, Examples, Table 1 and Claims).

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

15. No claim is allowed.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip Gambel whose telephone number is (571) 272-0844. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Phillip Gambel, PhD.
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 1600
March 15, 2004

10/042421

Application No.:

NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s)

- ☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to these regulations, published at 1114 OG 29, May 15, 1990 and at 55 FR 18230, May 1, 1990.
- ☐ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).
- ☐ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."
- ☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).
- ☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 7. Other: _____

Applicant Must Provide:

- ☒ An ~~Initial~~ or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing".
- ☒ An ~~Initial~~ or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification.
- ☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-4216

For CRF Submission Help, call (703) 308-4212

For PatentIn software help, call (703) 308-6856

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR RESPONSE

COPY FOR [] File [] Applicant